

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

All claims 17-29 and 31-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by newly-applied USP 5,742,5830 to Scott. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Scott describes a receiver system for antenna diversity employing a single backhaul cable that couples the receiver to a plurality of antennas. The signals from the antennas are combined onto the single backhaul cable using frequency offsets, spread spectrum code division, time division, or a combination thereof. At the receiver, the signals from the antennas are decoupled, in the case of frequency offsets, by splitting the backhaul signal into a plurality of duplicate signals, frequency shifting selected ones of the duplicate signals, and correlating said frequency shifted signals. See Abstract.

To establish that a claim is anticipated, the Examiner must point out where each and every limitation in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentec, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Every limitation contained in the claims must be present in the reference, and if even one limitation is missing from the reference, then it does not anticipate the claim. *Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Scott fails to satisfy this rigorous standard.

A significant feature in Scott, as evident from Scott's claim 1, is a "means for isolating each one of said antenna signals with a frequency offset from each of the others of said antenna signals, thereby generating a plurality of offset signals, said frequency offset being less than the bandwidth of said transmitted signal" (emphasis added). Scott illustrates this small frequency offset in Figs. 3b and 3c. Indeed, Scott makes plain the importance of that frequency offset

being as small as possible: “The frequency offset  $+F_0$  is preferably kept as small as possible but large enough to maintain signal isolation with the other antenna signal 140.” Col. 4, lines 34-36.

In contrast, amended claim 17 now recites: “converting one or more received antenna signals into a corresponding number of different frequency signals by mixing with a first set of a corresponding number of reference signals, where the one or more converted antenna signals is offset in frequency from at least one of the other received signals by a first frequency offset greater than a bandwidth of the transmitted signal.” Similarly, claim 24 recites: “one or more frequency converters each adapted to convert a respective antenna signal with a respective frequency offset to a respective different frequency signal by mixing it with a predetermined frequency, where each respective different frequency signal is offset in frequency from at least one of the other received signals by its respective frequency offset which is greater than a bandwidth of the transmitted signal.” Example support for the amendments to these claims may be found at Figures 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 which show that the frequency offset is larger than the bandwidth of the transmitted signal as well at paragraphs [0016], [0046], and [0052].

In contrast, Scott explicitly states: “The predetermined frequency offset is selected as large enough so that the signals are sufficiently isolated from one another, but smaller than the full bandwidth of the received signal.” Col. 4, lines 9-12. This makes sense in the context of Scott’s invention which seems to be primarily directed to spread spectrum code division on the feeder, (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 30-32), rather than frequency division.

With Scott lacking these features from claims 17 and 24, the anticipation rejection based on Scott should be withdrawn. In addition, the Examiner should be aware that Scott’s focus is on applications where the distance between the antenna(s) and receiver is quite large, in fact much larger than the distance between antennas mounted on a base station tower, mast pole,


building, etc., for example. In contrast to the independent claims 17 and 24 which are directed to these kinds of base station antenna-receiver connection applications, Scott explains at col. 1, lines 43-44 that: "it is not unusual for an antenna to be separated from the receiver by as much as five miles." A connection distance of 5 miles differs by orders of magnitude from the height of a base station tower, mast pole, or building. There certainly is no mention of a "site comprising a radio base station (RBS) coupled to at least one tower-mounted unit (TMA) via a single feeder and including a receiver diversity antenna arrangement according to claim 24," as recited in dependent claim 32.

The application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:

  
John R. Lastova  
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:maa  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100